PSM
Biological Research

Opinion 2025 | Volume 10 | Issue 1 | 49-52

Open Access

Article Information

Received: May 15, 2025

Accepted: June 26, 2025

Published: June 30, 2025

Keywords
Biomaterials,
bioinks,
scaffolds,
3D bioprinting,
tissue engineering.

Authors' Contribution
EP designed the study; wrote and revised the paper and gave approval for publication.

How to cite
Pizoni, E., 2025. Bioinks for 3D Bioprinting and Rapid Prototyping: A Key Element in Tissue Engineering. PSM Biol. Res., 10(1): 49-52.

***Correspondence**
Elisabeth Pizoni
Email:
pizonielisabeth@gmail.com

Possible submissions
Submit your article

Bioinks for 3D Bioprinting and Rapid Prototyping: A Key Element in Tissue Engineering

Elisabeth Pizoni*[1]

[1]Medical Science - Universidade Estadual de Campinas Campinas – São Paulo-Brazil.

Abstract:
Bioinks are foundational to the progress of 3D bioprinting and rapid prototyping in tissue engineering. The emergence of accessible, high-precision 3D printing technologies has enabled innovative strategies for scaffold fabrication using biocompatible materials tailored to mimic the structural and functional characteristics of human tissues. These bioinks offer tunability, anatomical precision, and patient-specific compatibility; paving the way for personalized medicine. The proper selection and formulation of bioinks improve safety, performance, and reliability in regenerative applications.

INTRODUCTION

The global shortage of transplantable organs and functional tissues, exacerbated by chronic diseases, trauma, and aging, has driven the advancement of regenerative medicine (Atala, 2012; Wei *et al.,* 2024). Among the most promising technologies in this domain is 3D bioprinting, which enables the fabrication of customized, biologically active structures. Central to this process are bioinks: specially formulated substances composed of living cells and biomaterials that replicate native tissue environments (Mandrycky *et al.,* 2016).

While numerous materials show potential, only a select few currently meet the stringent biological and mechanical criteria required for functional tissue reconstruction. Selecting an appropriate bioink involves evaluating its biocompatibility, degradability, rheological behavior, and mechanical properties (Hospodiuk *et al.,* 2017; Banigo *et al.,* 2025). These factors influence the ink's ability to support cell viability, proliferation, and tissue maturation during and after the printing process.

Overview of 3D Bioprinting in Regenerative Medicine

3D bioprinting allows for meticulous control over the architecture of tissue scaffolds, including parameters such as porosity, permeability, and mechanical strength (Matai *et al.,* 2020). These features are critical for guiding cell behavior and ensuring integration with host tissues.

A typical bioprinting process begins with medical imaging (MRI, CT, or micro-CT) to construct a digital model of the target tissue. This model is then translated into a printable design using computer-aided design (CAD) tools (Ozbolat and Hospodiuk, 2016). The integration of biological and structural data enables the fabrication of patient-specific implants and tissue models with high precision.

The Role and Design of Bioinks

Bioinks serve as both the biological and structural foundation of printed constructs. Their composition determines not only the fidelity of the printed form but also the biological function of the resulting tissue. Two primary approaches are used in 3D bioprinting:

Cell-Scaffold Based: Combines living cells with a biodegradable material, forming a structure that supports initial growth and is eventually replaced by native extracellular matrix (Murphy and Atala, 2014).

Scaffold-Free: Directly prints cell aggregates that self-assemble and fuse, mimicking developmental processes (Norotte *et al.,* 2009).

An ideal bioink must exhibit:

Printability: Appropriate viscosity and shear-thinning properties to ensure smooth extrusion or droplet formation without damaging cells (Tirella *et al.,* 2009).

Biocompatibility: Compatibility with encapsulated and surrounding cells without eliciting immune responses (Gungor-Ozkerim *et al.,* 2018).

Mechanical Integrity: Sufficient strength to support tissue structure during maturation (Jang *et al.,* 2018).

Degradability: A degradation rate that matches tissue regeneration dynamics (Malda *et al.,* 2013).

Surface Modifiability: The capacity to bind growth factors and signaling molecules (Cui *et al.,* 2012).

Studies, such as those by Tirella et al. (2009), have highlighted how tuning viscosity and applying pressure-assisted deposition can optimize printing outcomes. Shear-thinning bioinks, in particular, help mitigate stress on cells during extrusion.

Material Selection and Functionalization

Bioinks are typically derived from natural or synthetic polymers. Natural materials like alginate, gelatin, and hyaluronic acid offer inherent biocompatibility (Lee and Mooney, 2012), while synthetic polymers such as PEG and PCL can be tailored for specific mechanical and degradation profiles (Chimene *et al.,* 2016). Increasingly, hybrid formulations combine both to harness the advantages of each.

Recent research focuses on integrating supramolecular functionalities that improve cell-matrix interactions and provide biochemical cues (Li and Mooney, 2016). Functional groups can be engineered to enable dynamic remodeling, cell adhesion, and targeted release of bioactive agents.

Current Challenges and Future Directions

Despite rapid progress, several challenges remain. These include improving resolution and cell viability in complex structures, developing standardized testing methods, and achieving large-scale production (Kang *et al.,* 2016). Additionally, bioreactor integration and non-invasive monitoring techniques are essential for ensuring tissue maturation (Ribeiro *et al.,* 2017).

Emerging research is exploring the inclusion of multiple cell types, vascularization strategies, and responsive bioinks that change properties in response to stimuli (Zhao *et al.,* 2021).

CONCLUSION

Bioinks are at the heart of 3D bioprinting innovation, acting as a bridge between material science and cellular biology. As research continues to evolve, the development of smarter, more responsive, and tissue-specific bioinks will be essential to realizing the full potential of regenerative medicine.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Author hereby declares no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Atala, A., 2012. Regenerative medicine strategies. J. Pediatr. Surg., 47(1): 17–28.

Banigo, A.T., Nauta, L., Zoetebier, B., Karperien, M., 2025. Hydrogel-Based Bioinks for Coaxial and Triaxial Bioprinting: A Review of Material Properties, Printing Techniques, and Applications. Polymers., 17(7): 917.

Chimene, D., Lennox, K.K., Kaunas, R.R., Gaharwar, A.K., 2016. Advanced bioinks for 3D printing: A materials science perspective. Ann. Biomed. Engin., 44(6): 2090–2102.

Cui, X., Breitenkamp, K., Finn, M.G., Lotz, M., D'Lima, D.D., 2012. Direct human cartilage repair using three-dimensional bioprinting technology. Tissue Engin. Part A, 18(11–12): 1304–1312.

Gungor-Ozkerim, P.S., Inci, I., Zhang, Y.S., Khademhosseini, A., Dokmeci, M.R., 2018. Bioinks for 3D bioprinting: an overview. Biomater. Sci., 6(5): 915–946.

Hospodiuk, M., Dey, M., Sosnoski, D., Ozbolat, I.T., 2017. The bioink: A comprehensive review on bioprintable materials. Biotechnol. Adv., 35(2): 217–239.

Jang, J., Park, H.J., Kim, S.W., et al. 2018. 3D printed complex tissue construct using stem cell-laden decellularized ECM bioinks for cardiac repair. Biomater., 112: 264–274.

Kang, H.W., Lee, S.J., Ko, I.K., et al. 2016. A 3D bioprinting system to produce human-scale tissue constructs with structural integrity. Nat. Biotechnol., 34(3): 312–319.

Lee, K.Y., Mooney, D.J., 2012. Alginate: properties and biomedical applications. Prog. Polym. Sci., 37(1): 106–126.

Li, J., Mooney, D.J., 2016. Designing hydrogels for controlled drug delivery. Nat. Rev. Mater., 1(12): 16071.

Malda, J., Visser, J., Melchels, F.P., et al. 2013. 25th anniversary article: Engineering hydrogels for biofabrication. Adv. Mater., 25(36): 5011–5028.

Mandrycky, C., Wang, Z., Kim, K., Kim, D.H., 2016. 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. Biotechnol. Adv., 34(4): 422–434.

Matai, I., Kaur, G., Seyedsalehi, A., McClinton, A., Laurencin, C.T., 2020. Progress in 3D bioprinting technology for tissue/organ regenerative engineering. Biomater., 226: 119536.

Murphy, S.V., Atala, A., 2014. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nat. Biotechnol., 32(8): 773-785.

Norotte, C., Marga, F.S., Niklason, L.E., Forgacs, G., 2009. Scaffold-free vascular tissue engineering using bioprinting. Biomater., 30(30): 5910–5917.

Ozbolat, I.T., Hospodiuk, M., 2016. Current advances and future perspectives in extrusion-based bioprinting. Biomater., 76: 321–343.

Ribeiro, A., Blokzijl, M.M., Levato, R., et al. 2017. Assessing bioink shape fidelity to aid material development in 3D bioprinting. Biofabric., 10(1): 014102.

Tirella, A., Vozzi, G., De Maria, C., et al. 2009. Substrate stiffness influences high resolution printing of living cells with an inkjet system. J. Biosci. Bioeng., 107(4): 415–421.

Wei, L., Yan, W., Shah, W., Zhang, Z., Wang, M., Liu, B., Xue, Z., Cao, Y., Hou, X., Zhang, K., Yan, B., 2024. Advancements and challenges in stem cell transplantation for regenerative medicine. Heliyon., 10(16).

Zhao, Z., Li, X., Li, H., Ren, Y., 2021. Stimuli-responsive hydrogels for tissue engineering applications. Bioact. Mater., 6(12): 4389–4410.